

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

v.

Hon. Hugh B. Scott

08CR354S

CHRISTOPHER BOYD,

Defendant.

**Report
&
Recommendation**

By Order of Judge William M. Skretny dated November 9, 2008 (Docket No. 1), the above case was referred to the undersigned, with the consent of the defendant (executed February 9, 2009, see also earlier consent executed on December 4, 2008), to take the defendant's plea of guilty and to conduct an allocation pursuant to Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure for a Report and Recommendation. The following is my Report and Recommendation as to the defendant's plea of guilty.

On December 4, 2008, the defendant entered a plea of guilty in this case, as set forth in the transcript of the plea proceeding (Docket No. 9), which is incorporated by reference in the initial written Report and Recommendation (Docket No. 10). But defendant's waiver of indictment (Docket No. 3) only waived as to Count I of the Indictment, the copyright infringement allegation, and was silent as to the second substantive count, filing fraudulent and false tax returns. After rendering a Report & Recommendation (Docket No. 10) that defendant's guilty plea be accepted, this case was remanded by Judge Skretny for further proceedings, in particular to determine if defendant has sufficiently waived indictment as to Count 2 (Docket

No. 11). Prior proceedings in this case (Docket Nos. 8, 9, 10) are incorporated in this present Report and Recommendation.

Defendant, at the February 9, 2009, allocution formally waived indictment for both substantive counts and acknowledged execution of a waiver of indictment. He again entered a plea of guilty for both substantive counts asserted in the Information, as set forth in the transcript of the latest plea proceeding (also incorporated by reference in this written Report and Recommendation). In accordance with my findings at the close of the February 9, 2009, plea proceeding, it is my Report and Recommendation that the defendant's plea of guilty accords with the requirements of Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.

It is recommended that your Honor adjudge the defendant guilty of the offense(s) to which the guilty plea was offered. The time from February 9, 2009, until Judge Skretny rules on this Report and Recommendation is excluded from the Speedy Trial Act calendar pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(1) and 3161(h)(1)(J).

It is further recommended that the Court sign and file the preliminary Order of Forfeiture submitted by the Government as referenced in the Plea Agreement.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), it is hereby ordered that this Report & Recommendation be filed with the Clerk of the Court and that the Clerk shall send a copy of the Report & Recommendation to all parties.

ANY OBJECTIONS to this Report & Recommendation must be filed with the Clerk of this Court within ten (10) days after receipt of a copy of this Report & Recommendation

in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), Fed. R. Cr. P. 59(b)(2) and W.D.N.Y. Local Criminal Rule 58.2(a)(3).

**FAILURE TO FILE OBJECTIONS TO THIS REPORT & RECOMMENDATION
WITHIN THE SPECIFIED TIME OR TO REQUEST AN EXTENSION OF SUCH TIME
WAIVES THE RIGHT TO APPEAL ANY SUBSEQUENT DISTRICT COURT'S
ORDER ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED HEREIN.**

Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); F.D.I.C. v. Hillcrest Associates, 66 F.3d 566 (2d Cir. 1995); Wesolak v. Canadair Ltd., 838 F.2d 55 (2d Cir. 1988).

The District Court on de novo review will ordinarily refuse to consider arguments, case law and/or evidentiary material which could have been, but was not, presented to the Magistrate Judge in the first instance. See Patterson-Leitch Co. Inc. v. Massachusetts Municipal Wholesale Electric Co., 840 F.2d 985 (1st Cir. 1988).

Finally, the parties are reminded that, pursuant to W.D.N.Y. Local Criminal Rule 58.2(a)(3), "written objections shall specifically identify the portions of the proposed findings and recommendations to which objection is made and the basis for such objection and shall be supported by legal authority." Failure to comply with the provisions of Rule 58.2(a)(3) may result in the District Court's refusal to consider the objection.

SO ORDERED.

/s/ Hugh B. Scott

Hon. Hugh B. Scott
United States Magistrate Judge

Dated: Buffalo, New York
February 10, 2009